

**From:** [Sivak, Michael](#)  
**To:** [AccardiDey, AmyMarie](#)  
**Cc:** [Smeraldi, Josh](#); [Reilly, WilliamJ](#); [Warner, Leonard](#); [Franklin, Elizabeth A CIV USARMY CENWK \(USA\)](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site- Final Feasibility Study Report- July 17, 2020  
**Date:** Saturday, July 18, 2020 5:49:39 PM

---

**Exemption 5, Deliberative**

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 18, 2020, at 3:16 PM, AccardiDey, AmyMarie <AmyMarie.Accardi-Dey@wsp.com> wrote:

Josh – The same technology (which is in-situ remediation) is being applied to GW Alternative 3, 4, and 5. Here are the differences:

- Alternative 3 is in-situ by itself across the site. Injections occur simultaneously across the site.
- Alternative 4 is in-situ across the site but injections are periodic and controlled as needed (along with pump and treat)
- Alternative 5 is in-situ ONLY on Lot 63/64 and Lot 58 and assuming institutional controls (CEA/WRA) to restrict groundwater use. Institutional controls will not achieve the RAO of restoring the groundwater quality.

**Exemption 5, Deliberative**

Please let me know how you would like to proceed.

AM

PS: Mark is going to take the kids to grandma's house tomorrow (Sunday), so I am available to work on the FS text. We will need to wait till Monday for Jeff to review my edits to the GW section and for Thalia/Sharon to fix the costs.

AmyMarie Accardi-Dey, PhD, PG, CPC

Phone: 1-914-620-5110

---

**From:** Smeraldi, Josh <Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov>

**Sent:** Saturday, July 18, 2020 1:32 PM

**To:** Sivak, Michael <Sivak.Michael@epa.gov>; AccardiDey, AmyMarie <AmyMarie.Accardi-Dey@wsp.com>

**Cc:** Reilly, WilliamJ <Reilly.WilliamJ@epa.gov>; Warner, Leonard <len.warner@wsp.com>; Franklin, Elizabeth A CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <Elizabeth.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil>

**Subject:** RE: Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site- Final Feasibility Study Report- July 17, 2020

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**Exemption 5, Deliberative**  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Thanks,  
Josh

---

**From:** Sivak, Michael <[Sivak.Michael@epa.gov](mailto:Sivak.Michael@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Saturday, July 18, 2020 10:28 AM

**To:** AccardiDey, AmyMarie <[amymarie.accardi-dey@wsp.com](mailto:amymarie.accardi-dey@wsp.com)>

**Cc:** Smeraldi, Josh <[Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov](mailto:Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov)>; Reilly, WilliamJ <[Reilly.WilliamJ@epa.gov](mailto:Reilly.WilliamJ@epa.gov)>; Warner, Leonard <[len.warner@wsp.com](mailto:len.warner@wsp.com)>; Franklin, Elizabeth A CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <[Elizabeth.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil](mailto:Elizabeth.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil)>

**Subject:** Re: Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site- Final Feasibility Study Report- July 17, 2020

See my comments below.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 18, 2020, at 6:29 AM, AccardiDey, AmyMarie <[AmyMarie.Accardi-Dey@wsp.com](mailto:AmyMarie.Accardi-Dey@wsp.com)> wrote:

Good morning Josh – I looked at the edits made by PPG. [REDACTED]

**Exemption 5, Deliberative**  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

The four technical edits that I would challenge are all on groundwater:

1. Their assertion that Groundwater Alternative 5 is feasible with oxidation for organics and reduction of Lead occurring simultaneously on Lot 63/64. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**Exemption 5, Deliberative**  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

2. Their position is that the groundwater would flow south and not circumvent the wall (just flow south), [REDACTED]

**Exemption 5, Deliberative**

3. Their assertion that their cost estimate for Groundwater Alternative 5 is the “cheapest” remedy. We would have to ask Thalia and Sharon to review their new cost estimate. MS: if It doesn’t meet the RAO, the cost really doesn’t matter. But should ensure the cost in the FS is accurate.
4. They are focusing their treatment on specific areas (Lot 63/64 and Lot 58). They assume institutional controls (CEA/WRA) on the rest of the Site. [REDACTED]

**Exemption 5, Deliberative**

AmyMarie Accardi-Dey, PhD, PG, CPC  
Phone: 1-914-620-5110

---

**From:** Smeraldi, Josh <[Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov](mailto:Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2020 7:44 PM

**To:** Sivak, Michael <[Sivak.Michael@epa.gov](mailto:Sivak.Michael@epa.gov)>; AccardiDey, AmyMarie <[AmyMarie.Accardi-Dey@wsp.com](mailto:AmyMarie.Accardi-Dey@wsp.com)>; Reilly, WilliamJ <[Reilly.WilliamJ@epa.gov](mailto:Reilly.WilliamJ@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Warner, Leonard <[len.warner@wsp.com](mailto:len.warner@wsp.com)>; Franklin, Elizabeth A CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <[Elizabeth.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil](mailto:Elizabeth.A.Franklin@usace.army.mil)>

**Subject:** FW: Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site- Final Feasibility Study Report- July 17, 2020

See below for link to FS. They clearly did not follow our instructions and continue to add groundwater alternative 5 among other issues. I can review sometime this weekend. I am not sure what to do about the tables and figures.

Josh

---

**From:** Ken Bird <[kbird@woodardcurran.com](mailto:kbird@woodardcurran.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, July 17, 2020 5:58 PM

**To:** Smeraldi, Josh <[Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov](mailto:Smeraldi.Josh@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Krall, Scott M <[skrall@ppg.com](mailto:skrall@ppg.com)>; Christin Dowling <[cdowling@woodardcurran.com](mailto:cdowling@woodardcurran.com)>

**Subject:** Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site- Final Feasibility Study Report- July 17, 2020

Good afternoon Josh,

Below is a download link for the Riverside Industrial Park Superfund Site Final FS Report.

[https://woodardcurran-my.sharepoint.com/:f/p/cdowling/ErmA6iVQwUdNnDcU4NdGzEYBR2t-7gdr5in\\_Wq1jkoE9Xg?e=f98kEK](https://woodardcurran-my.sharepoint.com/:f/p/cdowling/ErmA6iVQwUdNnDcU4NdGzEYBR2t-7gdr5in_Wq1jkoE9Xg?e=f98kEK)

Let me or Christin Dowling know if you cannot access the document.

Ken

Ken Bird, CIH, LSRP

Woodard & Curran  
300 Penn Center Blvd, Suite 800  
Pittsburgh, PA 15235  
Main – 412-241-4500  
Office- 412-535-0835

---

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.